

Vol. 1 No. 3 (7 March 1993)

Primary hatching by John Komar

In this issue you will find the continuation of a very poignant evaluation of the Napolitano abduction. You will also find an

independent investigator's evaluation of the Stefula 'Report'. In this evaluation, John Powell points to faults in both the Napolitano case and the Stefula 'Report'. Finally, we include the relevant part to the Roswell case from an interview with Kevin Randle in the radio show 'UFO's Tonight'. This article was forwarded some time ago by Gary Long.

This month's book review is on "The Evidence For Alien Abductions", by John C. Rimmer. The book was reviewed by Jeff Brewi and was forwarded by Gary Long from one of ParaNet's public conferences. If you would like to submit a book review/article for publishing in EUFON, please refer to end of this publication.

▲EUFONews 1 - 3

Page 2

07 Mar 1993

Final Report On The Linda Napolitano Abduction (Part 2 of 3)

by Joseph Stefula
Richard Butler
George Hansen

(Continued from last issue)

INITIAL PROBLEMS WITH THE CASE

There are a number of obvious but unanswered questions that raise immediate doubts about the credibility of the case.

The most serious problem is that the three alleged principal corroborating witnesses (Richard, Dan, and Perez de Cuellar) have not been interviewed face-to-face by Hopkins, although it has been over a year and a half since initial contact with Hopkins and over three years since the abduction.

Richard and Dan allegedly met with Linda and have written letters to Hopkins. Linda has a picture of Dan. Yet Dan and Richard refuse to speak directly with Hopkins. No hard evidence confirms that Richard and Dan even exist.

Though they initially expressed extreme concern over the well being of Linda, the alleged "Dan" and "Richard" waited more than a year before contacting Linda and Hopkins. Why? Furthermore, they contacted Hopkins before they visited Linda. How did this come about? After all, they knew the location of Linda's apartment, so it would seem that they would have had no reason to contact Hopkins. Why did they bother with him at all?

The woman on the bridge said that before contacting Hopkins she only discussed the matter with her son, daughter, sister and brother-in-law. Why didn't she contact other UFO investigators? Why only Hopkins? If there is some unclear reporting on this point and she did actually contact others, can such be verified? Has there been any investigation of this woman such as checking with her neighbors, friends, family, or previous employers? What is her background? Has

she had any previous relationship with Linda? These questions have not been addressed, and thus the credibility of the only directly interviewed, corroborating, first-hand witness remains in doubt.

Dan has spent time in a mental institution. Richard suffered extreme emotional distress, forcing him to take a leave of absence from his job. Assuming that these two people actually exist, one must now be careful in accepting their claims (even if offered in good faith). Despite their debilitating mental problems, at least one of them was allowed to drive a car with UN license plates. Are we really to believe that they returned to active duty in a sensitive position (presumably carrying firearms) and were given use of an official car?

Who was the doctor who took the X-rays? We are only told that this person is closely connected with Linda. Why isn't a formal report available? Given the alarming nature of the outcome, why wasn't there an immediate examination? Linda said that the doctor was "nervous" ▲EUFONews 1
- 3 Page 3 07 Mar 1993

and didn't want to talk about the X-ray. It is not clear whether Hopkins has ever met this alleged doctor. Instead, Hopkins showed the X-ray to a friend of his. Some have speculated that Linda may have simply put some small object in her nose and had a friendly X-ray technician assist. We have seen no evidence to exclude this possibility.

Linda claims that she was kidnapped twice, nearly drowned, and further harassed. Yet she refuses to contact the police, even after Hopkins' urging. During the February 1, 1992 meeting with Stefula and Butler, Linda asked if she had legal grounds to "shoot" Dan if he attempted another abduction of her by force. Stefula advised against it and recommended that she go to the police and make an official complaint. She declined.

If she was afraid, why didn't her husband contact authorities? The most plausible reason is that if a report was filed, and her story proved false, she could be subject to criminal charges. Linda's failure here raises enormous questions of credibility.

OUR INVESTIGATION

Despite the numerous problems outlined above, we believed it worthwhile to gain additional information because so many people had contacted us with questions. On September 19, 1992, Stefula, Butler, and Hansen traveled to New York City in order to visit the site of the alleged abduction. We found that Linda's apartment complex has a large courtyard with guard house manned 24 hours a day. We talked with the security guard and his supervisor and asked if they had ever heard about a UFO encounter near the complex. They reported hearing nothing about one. We also asked if the police routinely enter the complex and undertake door-to-door canvassing in order to find witnesses to crimes. They said that this was a very rare practice.

We obtained the name and phone number of the apartment manager and called him a few days later. He reported knowing nothing about the UFO sighting, nor had he heard anything about it from any of the approximately 1600 residents in the complex.

We also visited the site under the FDR drive where Richard and Dan purportedly parked their car. This was in a direct line of sight and nearly across the street from the loading dock of the New York Post. We spoke with an employee of the Post, who told us that the dock was in use through most of the night. A few days later, we called the New York Post and spoke to the person who was the loading dock manager in 1989. He told us that the dock is in use until 5:00 a.m. and that there are many trucks that come and go frequently during the early morning hours. The manager knew nothing of the UFO which supposedly appeared only a couple blocks away.

Also in September, a colleague of ours contacted the Downtown Heliport, on Pier Six on the East River of Manhattan. That is the only heliport on the east side of Manhattan between Linda's apartment and the lower tip of the island. Our colleague was informed that the normal hours of operation of the heliport are from 7:00 a.m to 7:00 p.m. The Senior Airport Operations Agent researched the records and found that

EUFO News 1
- 3 Page 4 07 Mar 1993

there were no helicopter movements on November 30, 1989 before normal hours. Our colleague was also told that about six months previously, the heliport authorities had been approached by a man in his fifties with white hair who had made a similar inquiry. That man had asked about a UFO that had crashed into the East River.

The Meeting of October 3

On October 3, 1992, we met with Hopkins and his colleagues at his residence in Manhattan. Among those in attendance were David Jacobs, Walter H. Andrus, and Jerome Clark. During our meeting a number of questions were raised, and some of Hopkins' answers revealed a great deal about his investigations as well as the attitudes of Jacobs, Andrus, and Clark. Linda's statements also told us much.

We inquired if Hopkins had asked the guards of the apartment complex whether they had seen the UFO. He indicated that he had not done so. This is quite surprising, considering that the UFO was so bright that the woman on the bridge had to shield her eyes from it even though she was more than a quarter mile distant. One would have thought that Hopkins would have made inquiries of the guards considering the spectacular nature of the event.

We noted that Linda had claimed that police canvassing of her apartment complex was a common occurrence. We asked Hopkins if he had attempted to verify this with the guards or the building manager. He indicated that he did not feel it necessary. Although this is a minor

point, it is one of the few directly checkable statements made by Linda, but Hopkins did not attempt to confirm it.

We asked about the weather on the night of the abduction. Amazingly, Hopkins told us that he didn't know the weather conditions for that period. This was perhaps one of the most revealing moments, and it gives great insight into Hopkins' capabilities as an investigator. If the weather had been foggy, rainy, or snowing, the visibility could have been greatly hampered, and the reliability of the testimony of the witnesses would need to be evaluated accordingly. Even the very first form in the MUFON Field Investigator's Manual requests information on weather conditions (Fowler, 1983, p. 30). We ourselves did check the weather and knew the conditions did not impede visibility. But the fact that Hopkins apparently had not bothered to obtain even this most basic investigatory information was illuminating. He claims to have much supporting evidence that he has not revealed to outsiders; however, because of Hopkins' demonstrated failure to check even the most rudimentary facts, we place absolutely no credence in his undisclosed "evidence."

During the discussions, Hopkins' partisans made allusions to other world figures involved in this event, though they did not give names. Hopkins' supporters, who had been given information denied to us, seemed to believe that there was a large motorcade that carried Perez de Cuellar and these other dignitaries in the early morning hours of November 30, 1989. At the meeting, we presented an outside expert consultant who for many years had served in dignitary protective services. He described the extensive preplanning required for moving officials and the massive coordination during the movements. Many

Page 5 07 Mar 1993

people and networks would be alerted if there were any problems at all (such as a car stalling, or a delay in passing checkpoints). His detailed presentation seemed to take Hopkins aback. The consultant listed several specialized terms used by the dignitary protective services and suggested that Hopkins ask Richard and Dan the meaning of those terms as a test of their knowledge, and thus credibility. As far as we know, Hopkins has failed to contact Richard and Dan about that matter.

During the beginning part of the October 3 meeting, Linda's husband answered a few questions (in a very quiet voice). He seemed to have difficulty with some of them, and Linda spoke up to "correct" his memory. He left the meeting very early, even though Linda was under considerable stress, and despite the fact that she was overheard asking him to stay by her side. His leaving raised many questions in our minds.

Linda also responded to questions during the meeting. Early in the discussion, Hansen asked Linda's husband whether he was born and raised in the U.S. He replied that he had come to this country when he was 17.

Linda promptly interjected that she knew why Hansen had asked that

question. During a prior telephone conversation between Linda and Hansen, Linda had asserted that her husband was born and raised in New York. She acknowledged that she had previously deliberately misled Hansen.

Later in the meeting the question arose about a financial agreement between Linda and Hopkins. Stefula noted that Linda had told him that she and Hopkins had an agreement to split profits from a book. Hopkins denied that there was any such arrangement, and Linda then claimed that she had deliberately planted disinformation.

During the meeting, reports were heard from two psychologists. They concluded that Linda's intelligence was in the "average" range. One suggested that Linda would need the mind of a Bobby Fischer to plan and execute any that could explain this case and that she was not capable of orchestrating such a massive, complex operation. Although these were supposedly professional opinions, we were not given the names of these psychologists.

Ms. Penelope Franklin also attended the meeting. She is a close colleague of Hopkins and the editor of IF--The Bulletin of the Intruders Foundation. Hopkins had previously informed us in writing that Ms. Franklin was a co-investigator on the Napolitano case. In a conversation during a break in the meeting, Franklin asserted to Hansen that Linda was absolutely justified in lying about the case. This remarkable statement was also witnessed by Vincent Creevy, who happened to be standing between Franklin and Hansen.

Franklin's statement raises very troubling questions, especially given her prominence within Hopkins' circle of colleagues. Her statement appears to violate all norms of scientific integrity. We can only wonder whether Linda has been counseled to lie by Hopkins or his colleagues. Have other abductees been given similar advice? What kind of a social and ethical environment are Hopkins and Franklin creating? EUFONews 1
- 3 Page 6 07 Mar 1993

for abductees? We also cannot help but wonder whether Hopkins and Franklin believe it appropriate for themselves to lie about the case. They owe the UFO research community an explanation for Franklin's statement. If such is not forthcoming, we simply cannot accept them as credible investigators.

HOPKINS' REACTION TO OUR INVESTIGATION

In concluding his Mufon UFO Journal paper, Hopkins wrote: "if rumors are true and there are officially sanctioned intelligence agents within the various UFO investigative networks, these people will also be mobilized to subvert the case from the inside, even before its full dimensions are made known to the public at large" (Hopkins, 1992c, p. 16). Hopkins apparently takes this idea quite seriously. After he learned of our investigation, he warned Butler that he suspected Butler

and Stefula of being government agents and that he planned to inform others of his suspicions. A few weeks after our October 3 meeting, he told people that he suspected Hansen of being a CIA agent. This was not an offhand remark made to a friend in an informal setting; rather this was asserted to a woman whom he did not know and who had happened to attend one of his lectures (member of MUFON in New Jersey who feared future repercussions if her name was mentioned, personal communication, November 7, 1992).

A POSSIBLE LITERARY BASIS FOR ELEMENTS OF THE STORY

This case is quite exotic, even for a UFO abduction. Government agents are involved, the UN Secretary General is a key witness, Linda was kidnapped in the interests of national security, concerns are expressed about world peace, the CIA is attempting to discredit the case, and the ETs helped end the Cold War. The story is truly marvelous, and one might wonder about its origin. We wish to draw the readers' attention to the science fiction novel, *Nighteyes*, by Garfield Reeves-Stevens. This work was first published in April 1989, a few months before Linda claimed to have been abducted from her apartment.

The experiences reported by Linda seem to be a composite of those of two characters in *Nighteyes*: Sarah and Wendy. The parallels are striking; some are listed in Table 1. We have not bothered to include the similarities commonly reported in abduction experiences (e.g., implants, bodily examinations, probes, etc.). The parallels are sufficiently numerous to lead us to suspect that the novel served as the basis for Linda's story. We want to emphasize that the parallels are with discrete elements of the case and not with the story line itself.

Table 1 - Similarities Between the Linda Napolitano Case and the Science Fiction Novel *Nighteyes*

- * Linda was abducted into a UFO hovering over her high-rise apartment building in New York City.

Sarah was abducted into a UFO hovering over her high-rise apartment building in New York City. ♣EUFONews 1 - 3

Mar 1993

Page 7 07

- * Dan and Richard initially claimed to have been on a stakeout and were involved in a UFO abduction in during early morning hours.

Early in *Nighteyes* two government agents were on a stakeout and became involved in a UFO abduction during early morning hours.

- * Linda was kidnapped and thrown into a car by Richard and Dan.

Wendy was kidnapped and thrown into a van by Derek and Merril.

* Linda claimed to have been under surveillance by someone in a van.

Vans were used for surveillance in Nighteyes.

* Dan is a security and intelligence agent.

Derek was an FBI agent.

* Dan was hospitalized for emotional trauma.

One of the government agents in Nighteyes was hospitalized for emotional trauma.

* During the kidnapping Dan took Linda to a safe house.

During the kidnapping Derek took Wendy to a safe house.

* The safe house Linda visited was on the beach.

In Nighteyes, one safe house was on the beach.

* Before her kidnapping, Linda contacted Budd Hopkins about her abduction.

Before her kidnapping, Wendy contacted Charles Edward Starr about her abduction.

* Budd Hopkins is a prominent UFO abduction researcher living in New York City and an author who has written books on the topic.

Charles Edward Starr was a prominent UFO abduction researcher living in New York City and an author who had written books on the topic.

* Linda and Dan were abducted at the same time and communicated with each other during their abductions.

Wendy and Derek were abducted at the same time and communicated with each other during their abductions.

* Linda thought she "knew" Richard previously.

Wendy "knew" Derek previously.

* Dan expressed a romantic interest in Linda.

Derek became romantically involved with Wendy. ♠EUFONews 1 - 3

Page 8 07 Mar 1993

* Dan and Richard felt considerable vibration during the close encounter.

During the UFO landing in Nighteyes there was much vibration.

* Photographs of Linda were taken on the beach and sent to Hopkins.

In Nighteyes, photographs taken on a beach played a central role.

THE REACTION OF THE UFOLOGY'S LEADERSHIP

One of the most curious features of our investigation has been the reaction of several prominent leaders in ufology. Indeed, in the long run, this may turn out to be the most important part of the entire affair.

After the MUFON symposium in July, Stefula had several conversations with Walter Andrus, International Director of MUFON. Andrus told him that MUFON had no interest in publishing any material critical of this case even though they had published an article describing it as "The Abduction Case of the Century." This is a most surprising statement from a leader of an organization which purports to be scientific. Andrus' statements should raise questions about the legitimacy of MUFON's claims to use objective, scientific methods.

On September 14, 1992, Hopkins faxed Butler a letter saying that as a long-standing member of MUFON, he was issuing an "order" (his word). He "ordered" Stefula and Butler to stop their investigation of the case. We found this very curious, and we wondered how Hopkins, as a member of MUFON, could believe that it was in his power to issue such an "order."

His letter seemed to reflect the mindset of a leader of a cult rather than that of an investigator searching for the truth.

For the meeting on October 3 in New York City, Hopkins flew in his close friend Jerome Clark from Minnesota. Under the sway of Hopkins, Clark strenuously urged that outsiders cease investigations, thus seemingly trying to reinforce Hopkins' earlier "order" (despite the fact that the case already had been reported in the Wall Street Journal, Omni, Paris Match and the television show Inside Edition). Clark (1992a) later committed his position to writing, saying that this case may indeed involve a world political figure and have international consequences.

Andrus and Clark are arguably the two most influential figures in U.S. ufology. Andrus is International Director of the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), and he organizes the largest annual conference on UFOs in the country and regularly writes for MUFON's monthly magazine. Clark is a columnist for Fate magazine, editor of International UFO Reporter, vice-president of the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies, and author of books and even an encyclopedia on UFOs. Because of their eminence, their statements should be of special concern to the UFO research community.

At the meeting on October 3, the kidnapping and attempted murder of ♣EUFONews

Linda were discussed. We informed Hopkins and the other participants that we were prepared to make a formal request for a federal investigation of the government agents responsible for the alleged felonies. Hopkins, Andrus, and Clark appeared to literally panic at the suggestion. They vigorously argued against making such a request. We could only conclude that they wanted to suppress evidence of attempted murder. We wondered why.

This situation seemed so outrageous that a few days later Hansen called Andrus, Clark, John Mack, and David Jacobs and asked them if they really believed Linda's story about the kidnappings and attempted murder. All of these individuals said that they accepted her account. We were forced to seriously consider their opinions because they had been given secret information not revealed to us. During the telephone conversations, Andrus and Clark again strongly objected to requesting an investigation by law enforcement authorities.

(Continued in the next issue of EUFON)

John Powell On The Linda Napolitano Abduction

by John Powell

"...this case is likely to have a substantial impact on the field of ufology."

Yes indeed it is. We had all better get our seatbelts on for this one.

A little disclaimer is in order. I have been critical of the Linda Case and the manner in which Hopkins has seen fit to publish it but that doesn't mean I have chosen sides. In what follows you'll see that I'm equally critical of the 'other side' and the important disclaimer here is that I intentionally do not make the distinction between 'sides.'

The report (Memo) contained a number of serious charges for which no documentation was provided:

Lack Of Documentation:

"Leadership in both the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON) and the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS) aggressively opposed our investigation, and both previously refused to publish our criticisms. This raises grave questions about the scientific and journalistic integrity of MUFON and CUFOS."

This is a serious charge and it should have been documented in this report (or not mentioned). (Not counting the 'recommendation' to postpone investigations made by Clark, et. at.) How many and which articles were submitted for publication? Where are the rejection letters?
Page 10 07 Mar 1993

letters?

"Several prominent leaders in ufology have become involved, and their behavior and statements have been quite curious. Some have aggressively attempted to suppress evidence of a purported attempted murder. The implications for the understanding of ufology are discussed."

Another very serious charge that is undocumented... (The charge of suppressing evidence explicitly contains within it the assumed fact that such evidence exists and this has not been documented.)

"...February 1, 1992, Linda, Stefula and Butler met in New York City, and Linda provided additional details about her experiences (described below). During that meeting, she asked them not to inform Hopkins of their discussions."

Another very serious charge that is undocumented... Were these meetings tape-recorded?

"We contacted Hopkins in an attempt to resolve these matters, but he declined to meet with us, saying that he didn't want to discuss the case until his book manuscript was submitted. Despite his initial reluctance, eventually a meeting was arranged on October 3, 1992 at Hopkins' home, and a few more details then emerged."

Another very serious charge that is undocumented. As late as 12/92 Jacobs has publically stated that Hopkins did not yet have a publisher.

"Linda also told us that she had an agreement with Budd Hopkins to split equally any profits from a book on the case."

"Later in the meeting the question arose about a financial agreement between Linda and Hopkins. Stefula noted that Linda had told him that she and Hopkins had an agreement to split profits from a book. Hopkins denied that there was any such arrangement, and Linda then claimed that she had deliberately planted disinformation."

Not documented? I bet Stefula wishes he had tape-recorded the interviews now...

Major Problems:

"After receiving the letter [Richard/Dan letter to Hopkins more than one year later], Hopkins promptly called Linda and told her that she might expect a visit from two policemen. A few days later, Linda telephoned Hopkins to tell him that she had been visited by Richard and Dan."

Fortunately, Hopkins promptly read this letter, unlike the first letter from Kimble, and Richard/Dan show up on cue...? Is the Kimble letter a solitary exception, and if so why, or what distinguished this letter from all the other mail that one can assume Hopkins doesn't read on the day it arrives?▲EUFONews 1 - 3 Page 11 07 Mar 1993

"Linda did remember another car being involved with the kidnapping, and under hypnotic regression she recalled the license plate number of that car, as well as part of the number of the car in which she rode. Hopkins reports that the numbers have been traced to particular "agencies" (he gave no further details)."

Why haven't Stefula (et. al.) reported this to the police? They don't need anyone's permission to do so. They were told by the alleged victim of a kidnapping and they are aware of the existence of supporting evidence... They are accessories to conspiracy after the fact if they do not officially file a police report.

"This gave Linda a chance to search the premises; she recovered her cassette tape and discovered stationery bearing a Central Intelligence Agency letterhead."

Has the stationary been examined? (The Watermark would be enough to identify it and the CIA would probably cooperate...) Of course, we don't know what kind of stationary it is... (If you send a letter to the CIA and apply for the job of Director you'll get a pleasant form letter back - on CIA stationary...)

"Linda also asserted that on December 15 and December 16, 1991, one of the men had tried to make contact with her near the shopping area of the South Street Seaport. He was driving a large black sedan with Saudi Arabian United Nations license plates."

How was Linda able to identify the country of origin of a diplomatic license plate? She did this on her own?

"At the February 1 meeting, Linda mentioned that Hopkins had received a letter from "the third man" (the VIP)...

Yet another piece of _PHYSICAL EVIDENCE_... Has Hopkins acknowledged that this letter exists? If it exists he will eventually have to present it for examination...

"We also learned that the third man was actually Javier Perez de

Cuellar, at that time Secretary General of the United Nations. Linda claimed that the various vehicles used in her kidnappings had been traced to several countries' missions at the UN."

How would Linda know this? It would be extremely irregular and unprofessional for Hopkins to reveal this (the identity of the VIP and the traced license plates) to her. What does Hopkins say?

"In November 1991 a doctor, whom Hopkins describes as "closely connected with Linda," took an X-ray of Linda's head because she knew about the story of the nasal implant and because Linda frequently spoke of the problem with her nose. The X-ray was not developed immediately. A few days later the doctor brought it to Linda but was very nervous and unwilling to discuss it."

Who took the X-ray, will this person go on record, has Hopkins talked
- 3 Page 12 07 Mar 1993

with her? Is this the same doctor from the 4/89 visit?

"The most serious problem is that the three alleged principal corroborating witnesses (Richard, Dan, and Perez de Cuellar) have not been interviewed face- to-face by Hopkins, although it has been over a year and a half since initial contact with Hopkins and over three years since the abduction."

This is obviously a serious problem especially since "Dan" is apparently dead! However, Linda alleges that Hopkins has traced the license plates and has a letter from Perez de Cuellar. How about handwriting analysis?

"Who was the doctor who took the X-rays? We are only told that this person is closely connected with Linda. Why isn't a formal report available? Given the alarming nature of the outcome, why wasn't there an immediate examination? Linda said that the doctor was "nervous" and didn't want to talk about the X-ray. It is not clear whether Hopkins has ever met this alleged doctor. Instead, Hopkins showed the X-ray to a friend of his. Some have speculated that Linda may have simply put some small object in her nose and had a friendly X-ray technician assist. We have seen no evidence to exclude this possibility."

Why is it "not clear whether Hopkins has ever met" the doctor, and which doctor are we talking about? (Or are the 4/89 and 11/91 visits with the same doctor?) Has Hopkins been directly asked this question?

As with Richard/Dan, do we even know if these doctors exist?

"Also in September, a colleague of ours contacted the Downtown Heliport, on Pier Six on the East River of Manhattan. That is the only heliport on the east side of Manhattan between Linda's apartment and the lower tip of the island. Our colleague was

informed that the normal hours of operation of the heliport are from 7:00 a.m to 7:00 p.m. The Senior Airport Operations Agent researched the records and found that there were no helicopter movements on November 30, 1989 before normal hours. Our colleague was also told that about six months previously, the heliport authorities had been approached by a man in his fifties with white hair who had made a similar inquiry. That man had asked about a UFO that had crashed into the East River."

Did anyone show this person a picture of Hopkins!? While I think the insinuation is unprofessional I clearly see that the Richard/Dan element is tattered... (Maybe that's why Dan had to go...)

"We inquired if Hopkins had asked the guards of the apartment complex whether they had seen the UFO. He indicated that he had not done so."

Problem...

"We noted that Linda had claimed that police canvassing of her apartment complex was a common occurrence. We asked Hopkins if he had attempted to verify this with the guards or the building manager. He indicated that he did not feel it necessary."

1 - 3

Page 13 07 Mar 1993

manager. He indicated that he did not feel it necessary."

Problem...

"We asked about the weather on the night of the abduction. Amazingly, Hopkins told us that he didn't know the weather conditions for that period."

Problem...

Are these problems or is Hopkins simply refusing to reveal _any_ details to Stefula (et. al.). Hopkins _seems_ to be completely unresponsive in this matter.

"On September 14, 1992, Hopkins faxed Butler a letter saying that as a long-standing member of MUFON, he was issuing an "order" (his word). He "ordered" Stefula and Butler to stop their investigation of the case. We found this very curious, and we wondered how Hopkins, as a member of MUFON, could believe that it was in his power to issue such an "order." His letter seemed to reflect the mindset of a leader of a cult rather than that of an investigator searching for the truth."

Why isn't this letter included in this report!? Stefula (et. al.) have a problem 'trusting' Hopkins yet they expect _us_ to 'trust' _them_. Why should I?

Minor problems:

"Hopkins has collaborated with university professors in co-authoring an article in the book Unusual Personal Experiences (1992), which was sent to 100,000 mental health professionals."

It wasn't a book, it was a pamphlet...

"She reported that on the morning of October 15, 1991, Dan accosted her on the street and pulled her into a red Jaguar sports car."

A rather expensive car to own, operate and insure in NYC especially for a security guard...

"The woman on the bridge said that before contacting Hopkins she only discussed the matter with her son, daughter, sister and brother-in-law. Why didn't she contact other UFO investigators? Why only Hopkins?"

Kimble provides the answer in her letter and Stefula (et. al.) previously acknowledge that Hopkins is a leader in the field and widely recognized therefore I don't see this as amounting to much.

"If there is some unclear reporting on this point and she did actually contact others, can such be verified?"

Stefula's paper/case is not enhanced by inventing questions for which there is no case material basis...[▲]EUFONews 1 - 3 Page 14 07 Mar 1993

"Dan has spent time in a mental institution. Richard suffered extreme emotional distress, forcing him to take a leave of absence from his job. Assuming that these two people actually exist, one must now be careful in accepting their claims (even if offered in good faith). Despite their debilitating mental problems, at least one of them was allowed to drive a car with UN license plates. Are we really to believe that they returned to active duty in a sensitive position (presumably carrying firearms) and were given use of an official car?"

This is another minor point. Richard's "extreme emotional distress" could have been anything from acting to job stress and we have no way of knowing if it affected his work or was even noticed by his superiors. Dan's time in a "mental institution" could very well have been specifically job-related, we have no way of knowing at this point and since he's dead we may never know...

"During the meeting, reports were heard from two psychologists. They concluded that Linda's intelligence was in the "average" range. One suggested that Linda would need the mind of a Bobby Fischer to plan and execute any hoax that could explain this case and that she was not capable of orchestrating such a massive, complex operation. Although these were supposedly professional opinions, we were not given the names of these

psychologists."

No real problem here. They will have to be made available eventually...

General Stuff:

"Though they initially expressed extreme concern over the well being of Linda, the alleged "Dan" and "Richard" waited more than a year before contacting Linda and Hopkins. Why? Furthermore, they contacted Hopkins before they visited Linda. How did this come about? After all, they knew the location of Linda's apartment, so it would seem that they would have had no reason to contact Hopkins. Why did they bother with him at all?"

This is a serious point. I found it to be the most serious point in the entire paper (in the entire matter to date not counting the terribly unfortunate demise of "Dan"). This entire matter becomes unremarkable without the Richard/Dan/Kimble addition and two-thirds of it is already shot full of holes. (I should say one-half since Dan is dead...) Everything begins with the first step and this first step is Richard/Dan contacting Hopkins more than a year later by letter. They didn't wait for a reply or even provide such a mechanism yet several days later they personally visit Linda... This element of the Linda Case is obviously a setup or a massive hoax. Richard/Dan, if they exist, became aware of the matter somehow. Perhaps they really did witness it, perhaps they got wind of it through Hopkins or Linda (apparently this was a hot topic at the abductee meetings), perhaps they got wind of it through a friend or contact of Linda's or Hopkins'.

The point is that Linda never said her abduction was witnessed, other people, who are undocumented to date and who are unconnected with either

either

Page 15 07 Mar 1993

Hopkins or Linda, popped up and said they witnessed Linda's abduction...

"Linda claims that she was kidnapped twice, nearly drowned, and further harassed. Yet she refuses to contact the police, even after Hopkins' urging. During the February 1, 1992 meeting with Stefula and Butler, Linda asked if she had legal grounds to "shoot" Dan if he attempted another abduction of her by force. Stefula advised against it and recommended that she go to the police and make an official complaint. She declined. If she was afraid, why didn't her husband contact authorities? The most plausible reason is that if a report was filed, and her story proved false, she could be subject to criminal charges. Linda's failure here raises enormous questions of credibility."

I think it is extremely unlikely that Linda's kidnapping stories could be "proved false" and from what (little) is currently known I also think it equally unlikely that the stories could be proven true. Rather, a more plausible reason is that she fears/feared slipping up under interrogation. (Admittedly, a Klassically plausible reason would be

that Hopkins has actually suggested against an official investigation because all of his related material would have to be turned over...)

"After the MUFON symposium in July, Stefula had several conversations with Walter Andrus, International Director of MUFON. Andrus told him that MUFON had no interest in publishing any material critical of this case even though they had published an article describing it as "The Abduction Case of the Century." This is a most surprising statement from a leader of an organization which purports to be scientific. Andrus' statements should raise questions about the legitimacy of MUFON's claims to use objective, scientific methods."

The MUFON Journal did eventually published Hyzer's critical report on the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze polaroids, as well as a follow-up piece by Hyzer... I am totally confident that the Journal will eventually present both sides (if two well-researched and documented sides can be mustered) of this matter.

"At the meeting on October 3, the kidnapping and attempted murder of Linda were discussed. We informed Hopkins and the other participants that we were prepared to make a formal request for a federal investigation of the government agents responsible for the alleged felonies. Hopkins, Andrus, and Clark appeared to literally panic at the suggestion. They vigorously argued against making such a request. We could only conclude that they wanted to suppress evidence of attempted murder."

This is an unnecessarily and melodramatic conclusion. Perhaps they are concerned with something even more important such as holding up a house of cards before it crashes on top of everyone... Or, maybe Hopkins knows he was setup, and let Clark, Andrus, etc. in on that, and has been trying to balance things until they can unwrap Mr. Big...

It should be painfully obvious to all of us that this matter is quickly falling apart at the seams. Now matter what happens next Hopkins' reputation will suffer. The elitist manner in which he has

Page 16 07 Mar 1993

teaspooned-out the flimsiest of pseudo-facts will be rejected by anyone who has and/or continues to independently investigate and research UFO-related material. (Even if it is aliens in spaceships someone will sooner or later ask him why he didn't tell us everything when he knew it.)

On the other hand, his reputation could be salvaged by exposing a rather large abduction hoax... This is the only possibility I can think of that satisfactorily explains what has already occurred.

'UFO's Tonight' Discuss Roswell

From: kuryakin@bcstec.ca.boeing.com (Rick Pavek)

This was transcribed by a friend who wishes to remain anonymous.

The following is from 'UFO's Tonight', carried on Cable Radio Network at 9:00 pm PST every Sunday.

The guest on the show was Kevin Randle, co-author of the book, 'UFO Crash at Roswell', Avon paperback, 1991. The interview covered the latest on this case from one of the leading researchers on this subject.

I won't review the entire Roswell story. There is a lot about it currently available from many in-print books. The above book is one, there is another by Stanton Friedman and Don Berliner called 'Crash At Corona' that is currently on the shelves. I also won't get into the argument that is going on between the two Roswell research factions, represented by the above two books. I will only say that the argument centers around the existence of a second crash site to the west of the Corona/Roswell site, in the Plains of San Agustin. With the exception of a few details, both factions agree about the first site, the Corona/Roswell site.

Since the interview was with Kevin Randle, I prefer to report just the work that Randle/Schmitt are doing on this case. Randle/Schmitt are also sponsored by the Center For UFO Studies in Chicago.

The Randle/Schmitt book has some very impressive testimony:

Col. Thomas DuBose then chief of staff for Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey, who was then commander of the 8th Air Force, of which the 509th Bomb Group at Roswell, was a part. Col. DuBose was in on the creation of the crashed weather balloon cover story per the direct order of General Clements McMullen, Washington DC.

Members of the 509th bomb group intelligence and counter-intelligence staffs (named in the book).

Former B-29 crew members who flew pieces of the wreckage around (named in the book).
in the book).[▲]EUFONews 1 - 3 Page 17 07 Mar 1993

USAF Brig. Gen, Arthur Exon, who was a former commander of Wright Patterson AFB.

So if you're interested, get the books, read the stories, and make up your own minds.

Summary:

A summary of the new information follows:

- Randle/Schmitt are now concentrating their efforts on investigating the impact area of the Corona/Roswell vehicle.
- There are now 7 first hand witnesses to the vehicle impact site. There were really no first hand witnesses to the impact site when their book was written.
- A better approximation of the location of the vehicle impact site has been made, based on the new first hand witnesses.
- Based on the testimony of these new first-hand witnesses, some of the 'conventional wisdom', such as the crash date, now seems to be changing.
- Randle/Schmitt have now talked to over 400 1st/2nd hand witnesses regarding the Corona/Roswell site.
- The crashed vehicle was tracked on radar before the crash.
- Kevin Randle claims to have handled a small piece of the crash debris, pocketed by one of the first hand witnesses.
- Randle provided additional information on why the Roswell Army Air Field released a press story that they had recovered a flying saucer.
- Although there was less specific information on this, there also seems to be progress that is being made on understanding the General Twining flying disk letter, of September 23, 1947.
- The claims of a second crash site on the Plains of San Agustin, over 100 miles to the west of Roswell, now seems to be in serious jeopardy. Back in September, the sole first hand witness to that scenario, admitted to lying about a small aspect of the case. So now there are no more 'credible' first hand witnesses to the 'Plains' site.

There is more information on some of the above below. Some of the following are exact quotes. If there are no quote marks, then it is a summary in my words, of what Randle said.

Q: Do we have anyone first hand who witnessed the object itself near Roswell?

A: There are now 7 first hand witnesses that are familiar with the craft impact site discovered near Roswell. It was only after 2-to-3 years of research that Randle/Schmitt started to find first hand witnesses. [EUFONews](#)
1 - 3 Page 18 07 Mar 1993

to the vehicle impact site. Randle/Schmitt have been researching the Corona/Roswell case now for a little over 4 years.

Based on the testimony of the 7 new first hand witnesses, the vehicle impact site is now located 25-to-30 miles from the debris field near Corona NM. That places it much closer to Roswell NM.

During the 7/4/47 3-day weekend, the head of the AAF, General Carl Spaatz, was on a fishing trip in the Pacific Northwest, where most of the sightings were taking place at that time (interesting).

Q: Have you ever looked into the possibility of a high powered radar site as contributing to the cause of the crash?

A: Randle indicated there were radar sites at White Sands, Roswell AAF, and Kirtland. This thing was tracked on radar for a period of time.

Randle was skeptical that radar could have been a contributing factor to the crash.

Q: Have you anything new to report from the recent Denver, CO engagements?

A: On a radio show during the Denver speaking engagement Randle was asked if he had ever seen any of the debris.

'I have actually handled a piece of the debris. A small piece of the debris maybe 3/4 of an inch long and 1/2 of an inch wide.

It looked like silver pumice with some stratification in it.

Very light weight.

It didn't crumble like pumice would. There was not that kind of a gritty texture to it. But it looked like pumice.'

Q: You're convinced that you actually handled a piece of an extraterrestrial craft?

A: 'I was told that what I was handling was a piece of the debris, yes.

Now the question becomes, it was not analyzed and all I could do was look at it and see what it looked like.

The question is always in the back of your mind, was this really a piece of the debris or was I being taken down the garden path.

I was told this was a piece of the debris from the craft that the fellah had been able to pocket.'

Q: Was this one of the original first hand witnesses?

A: 'This was a first hand witness! I have no reason to doubt his word at this point, at all. All I can say is yes I handled a small piece of the debris, as far as I know.'

we don't know about as civilians?

A: 'I would imagine there's a great deal going on that we don't understand.

We've been told again by some of our sources that there's all kinds of talk about releasing this data slowly. That sort of thing. We've been told that there is a small contingent of people who now are in control of this data, who really don't want it to come out! So it's kind of, take a choice, type of thing. We can speculate about things but we don't really have any answers about that.

The reason for the press release in 1947 though, that was part of the whole plan to keep this thing buried by having the lower headquarters come out with a story that they had a flying saucer, then a higher headquarters say: No, no, it was merely a weather balloon. You've discredited all the rumors coming out of Roswell at that time. And that was the plan, to discredit the rumors so people wouldn't be asking the very difficult questions. Well those dummies in Roswell, they thought they had a flying saucer, but what they had was a weather balloon.'

The Twining letter of Sept. 23, 1947 was talked about. Randle said that to explain fully what was going on would take a couple of hours. This thing was at the highest levels of security and at that level it's a very convoluted and complex system that's in place.

Q: What do you intend to do at this point forward ...?

A: 'One of the things we're working on is to of course track down additional witnesses to corroborate the impact site near Roswell and we're looking for documentation so that rather than having to believe what we say we can kind of prove what we're saying - and that's always been kind of what we're doing, looking for corroboration. But the investigation also encompasses looking at the stories told by people and finding out whether we can break them down under scrutiny.'

Q: ... How do the stories check out ... among the new witnesses?

A: Randle indicated that there are problems with certain conventional wisdom.

--< BOOK REVIEW >--

Title: THE EVIDENCE FOR ALIEN ABDUCTIONS
Author: John C. Rimmer, 1984

I have been reading a book called _The Evidence For ALien ABductions_
by John Rimmer C. 1984...

I would like to summarize and/or quote an experiment and the results.

The experiment was conducted by Alvin Lawson and William McCall.

The concept was to be able to distinguish the abduction info given during hypnotic regression between a real abduction and a hoax (the reason for the hoax for this particular experiment was irrelevant). They wanted a database of info that could distinguish real data from imaginary data.

"They began by locating a number of people who would be willing to participate in their experiments, but who knew little or nothing about UFOs - possibly a rather difficult task in Southern California where they operated...These...subjects were then 'led into' a UFO abduction scenario by means of a carefully designed series of leading questions, which suggested the bare outlines of the abduction but left the subject free to fill in the details. These details would come...from the witnesses' own imaginations. They would then be able to compare the imaginary abductions with the real events, and by a comparison of the differences between the two, would be able to gain valuable clues to use when trying to sort out any hoaxes in the cases that came to them as UFO researchers."

One interjection here- how did they know that their supposed known- the so-called 'real' abductions were in fact, real abductions? Not saying the supposed real were not real, but no comment in the text mentioned this point. I took the assumption that their real database were witnesses who were not led into the abduction or prior cases, possibly by other researchers.

"...But the experiments went spectacularly wrong...what happened was that the 'imaginary' stories were quite indistinguishable from the 'real' experiences, even down to tiny details..."

The text then goes further into the stereotyped abductee, some of the stories the witnesses gave, etc...until the text leads into the researchers conclusion, "Birth Trauma Hypothesis."

The point here is it is very difficult to distinguish between an actual abduction (if in fact they do occur) and the imagination. Possibly physical evidence (scarring etc...), but then who can prove an alien lifeform is doing the abduction? Much can be inferred into a mind through a prior programming which can come out in a later regression.

I believe little to no headway has been made into the proof of alien
abductions, other than stories told by potential abductees, which could be imagination or from other programming.
1 - 3 Page 21 07 Mar 1993

be imagination or from other programming.
1 - 3 Page 22 07 Mar 1993

Reykjavik, Iceland Conference

THE 1993 INTERNATIONAL UFO & EXTRATERRESTRIAL CONFERENCE
~~~~~

To be held in the most northerly capital city in Europe

REYKJAVIK, ICELAND

March 24 - 28, 1993

14 Top International Speakers from America, Russia, England, Germany and  
Puerto Rico will present information, recent photographic and film  
evidence, to be shown for the first time in public.

Other conference highlights include:

A full day trip to Snaefellsjokull Glacier, the most active UFO  
sighting area in Iceland and an area of strange powers claimed by the  
Icelanders.

An Icelandic Buffet Lunch Extravaganza.

An opportunity to extend and explore the Mystic Volcano Island.

Saturday night barbecue and fireworks display.

For further information:

London Tel/081455-9418  
Fax 071-3875711

Doncaster Tel/0302-768168  
Fax 0302-341643

-----  
Ozark UFO Conference  
-----

The Fifth Annual Ozark UFO Conference will be held on April 2-4, 1993. The location will be the same as in previous years, the INN OF THE OZARKS in Eureka Springs, Arkansas.

A minimum of 125 rooms will be set aside for people attending the Conference, with special room rates of \$36.00 for single occupancy and \$42.00 for double occupancy. Room reservations may be made at any time by calling the Inn at (501) 253-9768 or by writing the Inn at P.O. box 431, Eureka Springs, AR 72632. Please indicate that your reservations are for the Ozark UFO Conference in order to obtain the special room rates. The Inn's total of 125 rooms were completely sold out last year at least one month before the conference, so make your reservations early. Additional rooms are available at other local-area motels.

▲EUFONews 1 - 3

Page 23

07 Mar 1993

The registration fee for the Conference is \$35.00 per person, if paid in advance (through March 27, 1993) or \$40.00 per person at the door. Payments for Conference registrations should be made payable to OZARK UFO CONFERENCE FUND and may be mailed to :

Ozark UFO Conference  
Route 1, Box 220  
Plumerville, AR 72127

The Conference will begin at 1:00 PM on Friday, April 2nd, and will conclude at noon on Sunday, April 4th. Additional information may be obtained by calling (501) 354-2558.

The scheduled speakers for 1993 include Dr. John Mack of Harvard University (one of the country's foremost researchers of UFO abduction cases), Norman Oliver (UFO cases from England), Linda Moulton Howe, George Wingfield, Antonio Huneus and Forest Crawford. A number of "surprise" speakers is also planned, as well as a panel discussion featuring "abductees" and abduction researchers.

For those who have not visited Eureka Springs previously, the town is located on U.S. Highway 62, approximately 48 miles west of Harrison, Arkansas, 35 miles northeast of Fayetteville, and about 10 miles south of the Missouri border. Air travellers will fly into Drake Field at Fayetteville and a shuttle service will be provided between the airport and the Inn.

OZARK UFO CONFERENCE  
REGISTRATION FORM

Registration Fee: \$35.00 per person  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_



WILL YOU BE STAYING AT THE INN?    YES ( )    NO ( )

WILL YOU REQUIRE TRANSPORTATION FROM FAYETTEVILLE AIRPORT?  
YES ( )    NO ( )

Please send completed form and fee to:

OZARK UFO CONFERENCE FUND  
ROUTE 1, BOX 220  
PLUMERVILLE, AR 72127

-----  
Bordentown, New Jersey Conference  
-----

"The Fourth Great UFO/ET Alien & Abduction Congress" April 16-18 1993.♣EUFONews  
1 - 3                      Page 24   07 Mar 1993

Day's Inn, Rte #206 & NJtpk, exit #7, Bordentown, NJ. (5mi. So. Trenton)

Invited Speakers:

Timothy Good- "Above Top Secret"  
Karla Turner PhD. "Into the Fringe"  
John Mack,- Abductions-  
Jaques Vallee "Forbidden Science"  
Howard Menger "From outer Space"  
Frank Stranges "Stranger at the Pentagon"  
David Jacobs "Secret Life"  
Kevin Randal "UFO Crash at Roswell"  
Leonard Stringfield, "UFO Crash Retrievals"  
Ray Fowler "Andreasson Affair", "The Watchers"  
David Pritchard -Abduction Congress at MIT 1992-  
Ray Stanford "Socorro Saucer in Pentagon Pantry"  
CMDR. Graham Bethune, USN-Ret. - UFO PHOTOS-  
Richard Butler "Early Gods of History & UFO"  
Rosemary Goiley "UFO & Crop Circles"  
Jim Moseley -saucer (news) smear & NUFOC-  
&  
UFO out-of-print Book & Video Club.

For More Information Call 1-609-888-1358    Pat Marcattilio  
138 Redfern St. Trenton, NJ 08610.....

If anyone is interested, speak to Pat...

-----  
Lincoln, Nebraska Conference  
-----

EXPLORING UNEXPLAINED PHENOMENON 5, April 30 - May 2, 1993

Nebraska Center  
33rd & Holdredge St.  
Lincoln, Ne.

Pre-conference concurrent workshops, Friday, April 30th, 8-11 a.m.  
(\$5 each, not included in conference registration fee, payable at the door):

8-11 a.m: Dr. Janet Lingren, "A Brief Introduction To Jungian Dream Analysis"

8-11 a.m: James Smith, "The Possible Metaphysical Implications Of UFO Contact"

8-11 a.m: Joe Smith & Ray Jensen, "Dowsing: What It Is & How To Do It"

Conference Schedule-Friday, April 30th:

12-2 p.m: Harry Jordan & Dr. John Kasher, "NASA UFO Images/Iowa Mini@Flap Update"

▲EUFONews 1 - 3

Page 25

07 Mar 1993

2-2:30 p.m, break.

2:30-4:30 p.m: Budd Hopkins, "New Revelations About UFO Abductions"

4:30-5:30 p.m, break.

5:30-7:30 p.m: Banquet w/John Carpenter, "Abductions: Multiple Participants"

7:30-8:00 p.m, break.

8-10 p.m: Guided Ghost Tour by bus (\$5 each, approximately 50 seats, reserved in advance)

8-10 p.m: John Carpenter, moderator, "Close Encounters Panel"

Saturday, May 1st:

9-11 a.m: Raymond Boeche, "The Men-In-Black"

11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m: lunch on your own.

1-3 p.m: Kevin Randle, "The Roswell Incident"

3:00-3:30 p.m, break.

3:30-5:30 p.m: Stanton Friedman, "Crash At Corona"

5:30-6:00 p.m, break.

6-8 p.m: Valentino's Italian Buffet (\$7.50 each, reserved in advance)

8-10 p.m: Linda Moulton Howe, "Aliens, Abductions & Scientific Findings on Crop Circles"

Sunday, May 2nd:

8-10 a.m: Rosemary Ellen Guiley, "Crop Circles & Unusual Ground Markings Worldwide"

10-10:30 a.m, break.

10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m: Professor John Salter, "The Salter UFO Encounters"

12:30 p.m, conference adjourns.

Pre-conference workshops are payable at the door-no preregistration necessary.

Conference registration for # people\_\_\_\_@ \$45 (\$40 for members of the Center)

Friday night Banquet w/talk by John Carpenter # people\_\_\_\_@ \$17.50

Friday night Guided Ghost Tour # people \_\_\_\_@ \$5.00

Saturday night Valentino's Italian Buffet # people \_\_\_\_@ \$7.50

Send this registration and check or money order TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED

=\$♣EUFONews 1 - 3                      Page 26   07 Mar 1993

Payable to The Fortean Research Center, P.O. Box 94627,  
Lincoln, NE, 68509. Send no cash.  
Street address, City & zip code:

Thanks. See you in Lincoln!

-----  
Richmond, Virginia Conference  
-----

1993 MUFON INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM  
~~~~~

The 1993 MUFON International UFO Symposium will held in Richmond, Virginia, during the weekend of July 2, 3 and 4, 1993. The list of confirmed speakers are:

- Vincente-Juan Ballester Olmos - (Spain) -

- Colin Andrews - (England) -
- Cynthia Hind - (Zimbabwe) -
- Illobrand von Ludwiger (Germany) -
- Hoang-Yung Chiang, Ph.D. - Taiwan) -
- John E. Mack, M.D. - (United States) -
- George Knapp - (United States) -
- Linda Moulton Howe - (United States) -
- John F. Schuessler - (United States) -
- Wesley E. Ellison - (United States) -
- Jeffrey W. Sainio - United States) -
- Jorge Martin - (Puerto Rico) -

LOCATION: Hyatt Richmond Hotel
6624 West Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23230

RATE: Three-hundred and fifty rooms have been blocked for July 2 and 3 at the Hyatt Richmond Hotel for attendees at a special rate of \$62 per night for single, double, triple or quad occupancy by calling the reservation desk at (804) 285-1234 or FAX (804) 288-3961 and advising the desk that you are attending the MUFON 1993 UFO Symposium.

A limited number of rooms have been reserved for July 1, 4 and 5 for those arriving early or

Page 27 07 Mar 1993

▲EUFONews 1 - 3

staying over for a few days at the same rate.

Advanced reservations may be obtained before June 1, 1993, by mailing a check or money order for \$45 per person payable to "MUFON 1993 UFO Symposium" to the following address:

VIRGINIA MUFON
P.O. Box 207
Manakin-Sabot, Virginia 23103

After June 1, the registration fee will be \$50 or \$10 per session.

Calendar Of UFO Conferences For 1993

- [⬆️EUFONews 1 - 3](#)
[Page 28](#)
[07 Mar 1993](#)

Editor: Carlos A. Steffens

Baron Carlos's Castle BBS	MUFONET-BBS Network
+1-202-863-1493	+1-901-785-4943
FidoNet 1:109/160	FidoNet 1:123/26

The Electronic Unidentified Flying Objects News (EUFON) is published monthly with the purpose of providing up to date information to those persons interested in the research of UFOs. It is a compilation of individual articles contributed by their authors or their authorized agents. The contribution of articles to this compilation does not diminish the rights of the authors. Opinions expressed in these articles are those of the authors and not necessarily those of EUFON.

Authors retain copyright on individual works; otherwise EUFON is copyright 1993 Carlos A. Steffens. All rights reserved. Duplication and/or distribution permitted for noncommercial purposes only. For use in other circumstances, please contact the original authors, or EUFON.

OBTAINING COPIES: Issues of EUFON in electronic form may be obtained from the Baron Carlos's Castle BBS via manual download or file request. PRINTED COPIES may be obtained from Carlos A. Steffens for \$10.00US each PostPaid First Class within North America, or \$13.00US elsewhere, mailed Air Mail. Physical address obtainable from Carlos A. Steffens for purposes of obtaining PRINTED COPIES only.

SUBMISSIONS: You are encouraged to submit articles for publication in EUFON. Article submission requirements are contained in the file EUFONART.ZIP, available from the Baron Carlos's Castle BBS for download or file request.

□